Remark

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 7-10, 14-16, 18-21 and 27-30 have been amended. No Claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-30 are present for examination.

Drawings

Corrected drawings have been required pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d). Replacement formal drawings are submitted herewith.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Morris

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 7-8, 14, 17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Morris, U.S. Patent No. 6,862,185 ("Morris"). The Examiner asserts that Morris shows memory modules 201, and a memory controller 207. The memory bus splitter are not shown, but the Examiner suggests that these are embedded in the memory board to split the signals to the many connectors 202. Applicants suggest that since Morris makes no teaching or suggestion to the contrary, it should be assumed that the memory bus of Morris is completely conventional. In other words, the same bus lines connect in parallel to all of the memory chips in the memory modules without any splitter, as described in the BACKGROUND section of the present application.

The recitations of e.g. Claim 1 have been edited to clarify the nature of the bus splitter. As shown in Figure 2, the splitter not only splits the signals communicated between the memory modules and the memory controller, it also has a specific resistance

for each memory module, shown in Figure 2 as R_s and indicated by the resistors on either side of the split. The specification at paragraph 22 provides some examples of how the resistances might be determined. Morris simply has no information at all about how any busses connect any of the components together.

Accordingly Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the reference. Claims 14 and 27 contain similar recitations and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons discussed above. The remaining claims are believed to be allowable also on similar grounds and for the particular recitations set forth expressly in each claim, respectively.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Morris in view of Talbot, Jeddeloh, and Freker

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-3 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over ("Morris") in view of Talbot et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0166006 ("Talbot"), Jeddeloh, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0044933 ("Jeddeloh") or Freker, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,645 ("Freker"). None of these references were relevant to the recitations of Claim 1, discussed above. Accordingly, these rejections are respectfully traversed. While there may be further distinctions between the claimed invention and the teachings of these references, these are not waived, but are set aside at present in the interests of lessening the Examiner's burden in examining this application.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: February 16, 2006

Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980